

EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

"TOWN MEETING" MOVES TO TUESDAYS!

3:30 p.m., EDT 7:30 p.m., CDT 8:30 p.m., MST 8:30 p.m., PST

JULY 31, 1947

Town Meeting

Illinois U Library

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



What Should Be Our Policy for Aiding Europe Now?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

GEORGE RANDOLPH PEARKE

ROBERT W. KENNY

WILSON M. COMPTON

DOROTHY STEEVES

(See also page 12)

COMING

—August 7, 1947—

Is the Two-Party System Failing in America?

—August 14, 1947—

Have Women Failed as Homemakers?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

VOLUME 13, NUMBER 14



\$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF JULY 31:

"What Should Be Our Policy for Aiding Europe Now?"

Mr. DENNY	3
Dr. COMPTON	5
Mrs. STEEVES	7
General PEARKES	9
Mr. KENNY	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	15



THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 7:

"Is the Two-Party System Failing in America?"



THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 14:

"Have Women Failed as Homemakers?"



The Broadcast of July 31, 1947, originated from the Malkin Memorial Shell, Stanley Park, Vancouver, B.C., from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.D.T., over the American Broadcasting Company network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



JULY 31, 1947

VOL. 13, No. 14

What Should Be Our Policy for Aiding Europe Now?

Announcer:

To welcome America's Town Meeting of the Air to Vancouver, here is Mr. Arthur Helps, founder and president of the Canadian Town Meeting. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Helps:

Good evening, Town Meeting friends. This is the first time that two national Town Meeting institutions have joined together in one great international Town Meeting.

We in Canada shared war and rationing with our United States neighbors to win the war. Now we're glad to have the realization of that victory in this international festival of free speech, when supporters of Town Meeting in Canada join with listeners and friends of America's Town Meeting of the Air to try to find the right answers to many problems which face us in this mixed-up modern world.

Now in its fourth year, Town Meeting in Canada and the many

Canadian stations which carry its programs are happy indeed to have as our guests on this wonderful occasion America's Town Meeting of the Air and its founder and director, recognized by us as the outstanding crusader for world-wide free discussion.

And now we present the president of Town Hall, New York, and moderator and founder of America's Town Meeting of the Air, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. And thank you, Mr. Helps, for your gracious words of welcome. You and your associates are to be warmly congratulated on the splendid work you are doing here with your Canadian Town Meetings.

Vancouver is the great port city of the west, and boasts the second largest natural harbor in the world, and it is certainly one of the most beautiful.

No wonder your people are so friendly and hospitable here, Mr. Helps, for they live in a virtual paradise. Take this beautiful outdoor theater, for instance, where we saw the "Pirates of Penzance" here Monday night.

This is the third time we've joined hands with our Canadian neighbors in presenting a Town Meeting, and I trust it will be a frequent occurrence. And our subject this evening is one of the greatest urgency.

If you, our listeners, could visit tonight in the home of a resident of almost any country of Europe, you'd begin to get something of the feeling of poverty, near-starvation, uncertainty, and confusion that grips the hearts and minds of those unhappy people on that continent.

I said last week that I didn't think there was any important isolationist sentiment in America. To this extent I was wrong, for this week I heard someone say, "The Europeans started the last two wars. Let them stew in their own juice."

I'm sure that all of our speakers tonight will agree that this solution is impossible. Both morally and economically, such a solution—rather, lack of solution—would bring disaster to the rest of the world. What, then, should be our role in aiding Europe now?

On June 5, General Marshall proposed that the nations of Eu-

rope get together and discuss the long-term needs for recovery rather than relief, and intimated that if this were done, Europe could expect the full co-operation of the United States Government.

"Our policy," he said, "is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions which free institutions can exist. This, in essence, is what is known as the Marshall Plan.

Britain and France immediately took the initiative and invited Russia to a three-power conference to discuss Europe's needs. In the sharpest language yet used by the diplomats, Mr. Molotov rejected the Marshall Plan and warned Britain and France against acting independently.

Nevertheless, Mr. Bevin and Mr. Bidault, with equal frankness, stated their determination to proceed along the lines suggested by General Marshall. They called the conference and that conference is now in process. Was this the beginning of the so-called inevitable break between the East and West?

Commentators and editors and writers are busy these days trying to appraise the real significance of the progressive struggle between the chief protagonists —

U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. To what extent is this a conflict between the ideologies of these two great powers, and where does Britain's socialism fit into the picture?

In the meantime, the Marshall Plan is the number one controversial question before all countries of this continent and Europe—perhaps of Asia, as well.

Whether the principles of the Marshall Plan are accepted or not, one stark fact is transparently clear all around the world: That European nations, including Britain, are running out of money with which to buy food and material for recovery. It is generally agreed that the crisis will come this winter and it's urgent now that some action be taken in order to prevent widespread starvation and economic disaster.

As usual, our speakers are divided in their support of the Marshall Plan, but they are equally anxious that something should be done immediately. We are honored to have two representative Canadian speakers and two distinguished citizens of the United States as our speakers.

I'm happy to present at this time our first speaker, who is one of three brothers whose names are known the world around, each as a distinguished educator in his own right. *This* Compton is President of Washington State College at Pullman, Dr. Wilson Compton. Dr. Compton. (*Applause.*)

Dr. Compton:

A hard-working farmer, a neighbor of mine, a few weeks ago was helping me shock wheat on my farm in northern Virginia. We had just been listening over the radio to the reports of the Moscow conference. He was disgusted.

He said, "Those fellows remind me of two small boys on my farm quarreling over a rabbit. I told them that if they would stop quarreling with each other and raise rabbits, I'd get each of them one to start with. They did, and I did."

And then he added, "It cost us \$350,000,000—didn't it?—to win a war which started because some people wanted to take other people's rabbits. Wouldn't it be smarter for us to give them enough money to raise their own rabbits? Then maybe we wouldn't have to win their wars for them everytime somebody wants some more rabbits."

This may not be good history, but it is the plain, homespun thinking of the hard-working, hard-talking, hard-voting fellow who is the backbone of our American democracy. And it is at the heart of General Marshall's plan to help Europe help herself. We live in one world, but two worlds are trying to live in it.

From the military standpoint, the world is one. The atom bomb has done that. Economically and

politically, the world is two. The clash of ideas has done that.

There, gentlemen, you have the problem. We must act like one world if we are to have peace, but we must live in two worlds for the simple reason that there are two worlds.

We won't accept Russia's way of life; Russia won't accept ours. Then what do we do? We can't make one world as long as Russia won't go our way, and we won't go hers. The United Nations Organization can't make it either as long as there is an unrestrained veto and no international police force.

But if we can't have peace by agreement, how do we get it? Try another war? Some people think so, at least say so. In the Orient last year I heard some of our Allies' own nationals advocating another war now to clip the wings of Russia before Russia clips ours.

But among these private suggestions of "war now with Russia" one could easily detect a degree of expectancy that most of the fighting would be done by the United States.

It is true, of course, that the world is divided between those whose faith is greater than their fears, and those whose fears are greater than their faith. But, Mrs. Steeves, Mr. Kenny, and General Pearkes, we all know that if we

cannot get peace by agreement cannot get it by war either.

The Marshall Plan is not a plan. It is an idea, and not even a new idea. But it is a good one: that if the countries of Europe are willing to do for themselves and each other whatever they are able to do, the United States will help them get back on their own feet and get off the international do-

Once they have done that they can finance themselves through the International Bank as France now started to do. That essential also is Mr. Hoover's idea, an idea which he has steadfastly held ever since the day the German army marched on Poland in 1939. I know that because I happened to have had a long visit with him that fateful morning.

He foresaw then that the war would not end until Europe was impoverished and that the United States should keep itself in a position to help rebuild Europe, first as a humanitarian act, second, as a precaution against the spread of desperate communism.

Mr. Hoover's views in 1939 were strangely similar to those expressed again last year in Japan by General MacArthur, when he remarked to me "No nation nowadays really win a war until it has helped to pick up the fellow it has finished knocking down."

Evidently General Marshall believes that. I believe it. Whether you believe it or not, you can

impeach it on the ground that those who advocate American help in the economic reconstruction of Europe are merely scared of a trade recession and are merely trying to set up a buffer against it. It may be humanitarian. It may be self-interest, but it is not "dollar-diplomacy."

Does the Marshall plan make it easier for us to mix into the military affairs of other nations as well as their economic affairs? Of course it does. Does it make it easier for us to use economic pressure? Of course it does. These are the obvious hazards of the proposed aids to Europe.

We should stay out of its military affairs, and we can stay out if we really mean to. Yes, all this is dangerous, but if Western democracy has a choice between living dangerously and dying dangerously, the former is less dangerous than the latter. (*Applause.*)

Few nations go for communism and the totalitarian state by preference. They go for it by tragedy. General Marshall's plan assumes that the people of Europe generally will prefer some form of free society—some form of democracy—if they can get on their feet that way, stay on their feet, and stay out of war. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Dr. Wilson Compton. Now we are to hear from a prominent Canadian who would

speak for the other side, a charming lady who distinguished herself as an outstanding spokesman for the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation Party, otherwise known as the C.C.F. Mrs. Dorothy Steeves of Vancouver. (*Applause.*)

Mrs. Steeves:

Mr. Moderator and friends, Dr. Compton has made it all seem beautifully simple. Just encourage a co-operative rabbit-breeding party and everything will be fine.

But unfortunately, it isn't just little boys squabbling over rabbits. It's giant corporations and powerful states competing for oil and other vital resources. They are not going to agree to share it so easily. I'm afraid I don't see it through such rose-colored spectacles.

I would suggest, Dr. Compton, that we strip our proposals for aid to Europe of all pretenses and pompous phrases. We are doing this not primarily because we are bubbling over with the milk of human kindness, or because we want to promote democracy. Let's admit that aiding Europe to get on *her* feet simply means aiding ourselves to keep on *our* feet. (*Applause.*)

The truth is that we are scared to death. We are scared that our economy is going to collapse. Some of us are scared of communism—not as many as you might think—and all of us are scared of war.

The United States with its unhealthy boom is facing a bust, unless the pump is primed. The Marshall Plan may be even more of a lifesaver to the American economy than to Europe. That's all right, as long as the European peoples can be allowed to function under the economic and political forms which they choose to adopt.

That to me is the crux of the question. Can the United States leave it to Europeans to decide whether they will go communist, socialist, or capitalist? The Russians don't think so. To them the Marshall policy was damned from the start because it was the old Truman wolf dressed up in a Marshall sheepskin.

Even if that is true, I think that they blundered badly. I'm not one of those who believe that the Russians are so diabolically clever. They are often as stupid as the extreme reactionaries, because they insist on seeing the world in terms of black and white, whereas the world is nothing of the kind. We are going through a social revolution, and there are many shades of gray.

The tory mind is frozen, because it's afraid that someone is going to upset its nice little apple-cart. (*Applause.*) Yes, and the communists are the same. And that is perhaps one thing that General Pearkes and his colleagues have in common with the communists.

Now, then, if America wants to help Europe, let her do so without any thought of making Europe safe for capitalism — dangling carrots in front of the donkey's nose to lead it up the garden path.

In the first place, it can't be done anyway. British socialists have already made it clear that they want no interference. You see, *they* don't need to be afraid; they're democratically elected.

But there are places in Europe where American big business looks for green pastures. In Germany the United States is opposing the socialization of the Ruhr industry — something which the German people want. The Americans say "Put it off for five years." That means, "After five years, the cart will be nicely entrenched."

Europe needs American goods, but if they are going to be used as a big stick to re-establish capitalism and fascism, then Europe had better go it alone.

I'll go further. There would be no surer way of placing Europe under communist dictatorship than by suppressing the democratic way to socialism. In my opinion, European reconstruction should be a United Nations affair.

We are tending more and more to conduct our international affairs as if the United Nations simply doesn't exist. I know that time and procedure is a difficulty, but frankly, I think that the American Congress may hold up the work

far more than the United Nations would.

Aid to Europe is an economic matter and can therefore operate outside the scope of the veto. Moreover, the U.N.O. machinery for the replanning of Europe, the Economic Commission for Europe, is now in session at Geneva.

I'm insistent on this point, because there is no better way of strengthening the United Nations than by giving it something constructive to do. It's futile to expect it to act as a policeman unless it has first helped people get a social order worth protecting.

The United Nations Charter is based on the idea that war can be outlawed not by force, but by the creation of human rights. If we don't start giving the United Nations a real chance to build, it will wither away, and all you will have left will be a world divided into armed camps.

We, here in Canada, are vitally interested. Because the United Nations hasn't functioned, this continent is being built into a fortress under the tutelage of the United States.

We don't like it. We have only just emerged from under the skirts of Mother England, and we don't want to disappear under the still more voluminous garments of Uncle Sam. (*Laughter and applause.*)

I know that I speak for many Canadians who are determined

that they will owe allegiance to no outside power save the United Nations. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mrs. Steeves. Now, I am very happy to present one of Canada's most decorated military heroes—now a statesman—who started his career as a glamorous red-coated member of the famous Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

He enlisted as a trooper in World War I, and emerged as a Lieutenant Colonel after receiving the Victoria Cross and other high decorations from his sovereign. During World War II, he received the Legion of Merit from the United States of America.

He retired from the Army in 1945, and was elected to the Canadian House of Commons as a Progressive-Conservative Member of Parliament from Nanaimo, British Columbia. I am very happy to give you Major General George Randolph Pearkes. General Pearkes. (*Applause.*)

General Pearkes:

Do you know that I believe that Dr. Compton's farmer still believes that the Yanks won both of the wars?

The question as presented this evening places me in an embarrassing position because if I interpret "our" as applying to the United States, I may be accused of lecturing the good neighbors to the south. They wouldn't like that.

As a Canadian, my views are influenced by the fact that Canada is a member of the British Commonwealth, and Canada, notwithstanding what Mrs. Steeves has said, would naturally wish that any scheme adopted fits in with British plans. (*Applause.*)

Therefore, Britain has moved with extreme caution in planning for the International Trade Organization, mainly because some of the Dominions have urged the retention of a British preference. However, since the Marshall Program aims at a wider trade expansion, it has not failed to appeal to Britain.

As a soldier who has fought through two world wars, I feel above all things that we must prevent a third World War. And I heartily agree with Dr. Compton that the Marshall Plan offers the road to peace rather than the road to war.

Dr. Compton's approach is realistic. Realism is the best foundation for any international policy, though, as at present, it does not always give cause for great optimism.

After World War I, the U. S. A. and the British Commonwealth lent money to the Germans. These funds were in part used by the Germans to build up again their fighting services.

The American offer of today is to extend aid for Europe's reconstruction, provided the European

nations take the initiative in assessing their own needs, and draw up concrete plans for economic operation. There is to be adequate supervision, this time, to ensure that the funds which are provided are spent effectively.

In Ottawa, I heard President Truman state that "the purpose of the United States is to restore the world to health, to re-establish conditions in which the common peoples of the earth can work for their own salvation by their own efforts."

It was encouraging, therefore, to learn that the foreign secretaries of Great Britain, France, and Russia had met to explore their needs, and that in spite of Russia's withdrawal, Bevin and Acheson are continuing their conferences.

We shall soon have their report. What are we going to do then? Have we a concrete plan ready? Do we realize the urgency of the situation? Are we prepared to meet it with the great determination we did during the war?

I do not deny that we on this side of the Atlantic would have felt happier if all Europe had demonstrated a genuine desire to cooperate, but in spite of Russian hesitation, we must find a speedy solution to Europe's economic problem. The U. S. A. and Canada are great countries. They are in a position to act quickly.

Immediate action now is not inconsistent with the ideals of the world organization where inevitably a longer period of time is required to reach a decision. Whenever the nations are at odds, the U.N.O. is bound to reach a deadlock, making the organization impotent to act.

Why, only this week, Russia exercised the veto for the eleventh time. Veto, or no veto, obstacles can be put in the way of obtaining a rapid decision. What else can you expect when you have 54 nations talking 20 different languages?

It has been claimed that the Marshall proposals are directed against Russia. We are not interested in the domestic policies of that or any other country. God forbid that the States and Russia, like a couple of greedy hyenas, should fight over the starved carcasses of European people.

We do, however, resent the militant preaching of communism in other lands, because that philosophy carries with it the potential seeds of war. I believe that the Marshall Plan will demonstrate that democracy, rather than communism, can best serve the peoples of the world and will thus lessen the possibilities of war in our time. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, General Pearkes. You don't have to be a native of California to have heard of our

next speaker who served his state for so many years with distinction as attorney-general. He is one of the outstanding leaders of the Democratic party in the west, and has always taken a lively interest in international, as well as national, affairs. We hear now from the Honorable Robert W. Kenny, of California. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kenny:

All three speakers agree, and I do too, that it is to the economic interests of North America that we aid Europe now, and by now, I mean immediately. Now Dr. Compton's rabbits should be shipped at once so that they can get down to the work of producing.

I'm afraid, however, that in the United States, until we get past the next election, we are just going to continue to debate and to play politics with European recovery, and if we do, the rabbit that we send will be a good deal like Harvey—that imaginary six-foot rabbit in the play—that everybody talked about but nobody saw. And I also hope that what we do send is rabbits and not guns to shoot rabbits with. (*Applause.*)

Finally, when we do get around to aiding the people across the Atlantic, I want us to help the rebirth of a *new* Europe, a new Europe that is eager to provide a better life for its people and not to re-establish an old pre-1939 model of a "mittel Europa"—a

Europe that furnished prosperity only for a few and a fearful insecurity for everyone else. (*Applause.*)

Now these doctrines and plans

and diplomatic maneuvers seem to me must all be measured according to their tendency to serve one or the other of these two opposite objectives.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

WILSON MARTINDALE COMPTON—Economist, author, and president of the State College of Washington. Dr. Wilson Compton was born in Wooster, Ohio, October 15, 1890. He is the brother of Dr. Arthur Compton, atomic physicist, and Dr. Karl Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

He graduated from Wooster with degrees of A.M., and Ph.B., received an LL.B. at the University of Cincinnati the following year, and in 1915 graduated from Princeton University with a Ph.D. He spent a year at Dartmouth College as assistant professor of economics and was associated with the federal trade commission of the U.S. Shipping Board from 1916-1918. In 1918 he became secretary and manager of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association which office he held for 26 years.

In 1934 Dr. Compton reentered the educational field, when he became professor of economics at George Washington University, which position he held until 1941. During World War II, he was a member of the Advisory Board, Materials and Equipment, Quartermaster Corps, U.S. Army. In 1945, he became president of the State College of Washington.

Dr. Compton is the author of *Organization of the Lumber Industry* (1916), *Legal Aspects of Trade Association* (1930), *Forest Conservation—a Task in Engineering* (1939), and numerous reports, pamphlets, and addresses before trade organizations and scientific societies.

GEORGE RANDOLPH PEARKE — Major General George Randolph Pearkes, V.C., C.B., D.S.O., M.C., Legion of Merit (U.S.A.), Croix de Guerre, M.P., was born February 26, 1888, at Watford, England. Educated at Berkhamsted Grammar School, England, he came to Canada in 1906 and farmed in Alberta. He joined the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

At the commencement of World War I, he enlisted as a "trooper" in the 2nd Canadian Mounted Rifles and served with the Canadian Army until the end of the War. Promoted through various grades to that of Lieutenant Colonel, he remained in the Canadian Army at the conclusion of World War I.

During World War II, he served in command of the First Canadian Division

until September, 1942, when he was promoted to General Officer Commanding in Chief, Pacific Command, with the rank of Major General. For activities in connection with the operations in Alaska and at Kisko, he was awarded the Legion of Merit (U.S.A.).

In 1945, he retired from the Army, and was elected to the House of Commons as the Progressive Conservative member of Parliament for Nanaimo, B.C.

ROBERT W. KENNY — Former attorney general of California. Mr. Kenny is national vice president of the Progressive Citizens of America.

A graduate of Stanford University, where he received a B.A. degree in 1921, Mr. Kenny was correspondent for the United Press Association from 1920-23, and was on the staff of the *Chicago Tribune* in Paris in 1923. After attending the University of Southern California School of Law, he was admitted to the California bar in 1926 and since that time has been in the practice of law at Los Angeles. He has served as municipal judge of Los Angeles County, and as superior judge, and was a member of the California State Senate of Los Angeles County from 1939-42. He subsequently became attorney general for the State.

DOROTHY GRETCHEN STEEVES — Mrs. Steeves was born in Amsterdam, Holland, of a Dutch father and an English mother. She is a graduate of Leiden University, with a degree of Doctor of Laws. In 1918, she came to Vancouver, B.C., as the wife of a Canadian soldier.

Mrs. Steeves has always been interested in international and social affairs and has been a member of the Canadian Co-operative Commonwealth Federation since its inception. From 1934-35 she was a member of the British Columbia Legislature, representing the constituency of North Vancouver on behalf of the C.C.F. She is a member of the National Council of the C.C.F. and is first vice president of the British Columbia section.

A lecturer and writer on international and social matters, Mrs. Steeves has appeared many times on the Vancouver Town Meeting of the Air and on Canadian national and local programs.

I believe that a new Europe is in the making today—a Europe that will ultimately become a full partner with our own nations of the Western Hemisphere—a partnership that will be capable of maintaining a peaceful world and a better civilization than we have ever known.

But today this reviving Europe is much like the man engaged in the struggle with the bear, and he prayed, "Good Lord, if you don't help me, at least don't help this bear."

The least we can do toward helping Europe today is not to hinder her comeback while we are debating in Congress and elsewhere the positive measures that should some time be taken. And one thing that certainly would impede a new Europe is the current suggestion that the re-industrialization of Germany be permitted.

We must not forget the Potsdam agreement and we must not permit Germany to become an industrial nation again. (*Applause.*) I think we should remember that the Potsdam agreement was written while Belsen and Buchenwald were still an actual stench in the nostrils of the civilized world.

The great concept of the Big Three at Potsdam, you will remember, was that the great mistake made after World War I was not to be repeated after this war. That mistake was the collection of reparations from German production.

As General Pearkes said, German industry at that time was actually encouraged by loans from the British Commonwealth and from the United States. And Thyssen, Stinnes, and Krupp all flourished in the Ruhr in the twenties.

To be sure, some of the reparations were met by this revived German industry — they were met until the Germans felt strong enough to stop payment on reparations. And then, you will remember, there emerged out of this arsenal—the Ruhr—there emerged a war machine that almost crushed all of us just a few years later.

Now the Potsdam agreement provided for a different kind of a peace. The economy of Europe was not to be upset entirely, German industry was not to be destroyed, the German industrial plants were merely to be distributed, moved, and transferred to the victorious but devastated nations. Germany was primarily to become an agricultural nation, a safe neighbor for the other countries of Europe.

Now, it is at this point that Mrs. Steeves and I disagree. We disagree just as the British and French are now disagreeing in Paris. Mrs. Steeves thinks it would be all right to scrap the Potsdam agreement and allow Germany to once more become an industrial producer if her people want it so, provided, says Mrs. Steeves, her industries

are socialized and that the steel mills and chemical plants are owned by the new German government.

I must admit I prefer that position to that currently taken by the American State Department. The American State Department's position is that the new German industry must be controlled by private capital. However, my position is that even a socialized German industry is too dangerous an experiment in this Atomic Age. *(Applause.)*

Now, that's what France believes today, and believe me, France ought to know, because France has been invaded by Germany three times in the last eighty years. I cannot believe that the people of Rotterdam or any bombed city will sit quietly when the implications of this new, re-industrialized Germany are brought home to them. *(Applause.)*

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Kenny. Now we are about to take the questions from this fine Vancouver audience assembled out here under the trees in beautiful Stanley Park in the Malkin Bowl. While the speakers get ready for the question period, I am sure that you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message.

Announcer: Tonight, friends, you are listening to America's Town Meeting of the Air, originating in Vancouver, British Co-

lumbia, in beautiful Malkin Bowl in Stanley Park, where we are discussing the question "What Should Be Our Policy in Aiding Europe Now?"

We are about to begin our question period when Major General George Randolph Pearkes and Dorothy Steeves, Wilson Compton, and Robert Kenny will answer questions put to them by this representative Vancouver audience.

It is part of the Town Hall plan to have these Town Meeting programs originate, approximately half the time each year, in different cities throughout the country, so that we may have truly American audiences.

We are now on our western tour, and will originate programs during the next two months in San Francisco, Santa Barbara, Phoenix, Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Fe, Albuquerque, Dallas, and Kansas City, returning home to Town Hall, New York, October 7. Remember, we are on the air 52 weeks each year. Your Town Meeting takes no vacation.

For your convenience, copies of tonight's broadcast, including the questions and answers to follow, will be printed in our Town Meeting Bulletin, which you may secure by sending 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York to cover the cost of printing and mailing.

We are also very happy to announce that in tomorrow's issue

of the *New York Herald Tribune* you will find an excellent four-column summary of tonight's Town Meeting, including the questions and answers to follow. The

Herald Tribune does this each week as a public service to a better informed America.

And now for our question period, we return you to Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Now, then, everyone in tonight's audience is eligible to win a \$210 set of *Encyclopedia Americana*. If you limit your questions to 25 words and our local committee of judges considers it best for bringing out facts and broadening the scope of this discussion, a set of *Encyclopedia Americana* will be yours.

Now before I give you people out in the audience a chance, I'm going to call on someone who is not eligible for this \$210 set of *Encyclopedia Americana*. We'll assume he already has one. The Honorable Herbert Anscomb, Acting Premier of British Columbia, will ask the first question. Mr. Anscomb. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Anscomb: I would like to ask Mr. Kenny if he will tell us what is the solution to the economic problems of Europe if the Marshall Plan is not adopted?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Kenny. There really ought to be a prize for that one.

Mr. Kenny: I think that for immediate action, that is, while the debating is going on, that certainly the rabbits could be put into the production line. That is, min-

ing machinery should be put on order by some agency in the United States, a government agency; hydroelectric machinery should be made ready; farm implements should be put on order, so that once the course that the Marshall Plan is to take, once the debating is over, there will be nothing to do but immediately ship the necessary materials to aid Europe in its recovery, to the directions and destinations that have been agreed upon. That is certainly a job that can be done at the present time. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kenny. Now we go out to the audience. Will you give your name?

Man: The question is to Mrs. Steeves. If the Marshall Plan limits Europe's right to go socialist, why is the British Socialist Government so enthusiastic for it?

Mrs. Steeves: I haven't said that the Marshall Plan limits Europe's right to go socialist. We don't know yet what the Marshall Plan is.

As one British publication said, "General Marshall has just flown a kite." That's all we know. The

British Government is anxious for it because Britain is going through an economic crisis.

And I'm telling you this, that I'm convinced that if Britain has to choose between pursuing her socialist plan and getting aid from the United States under conditions which she cannot possibly adopt, then I'm sure that Britain will choose to go socialist because Britain knows well enough that if Europe again falls under the terror of domination by capitalist corporations, Europe will have war again.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman down here.

Man: General Pearkes. Are not the seeds of the next war contained in the struggle of American capitalists for Europe's market rather than in any communist theory?

General Pearkes: I don't think so for one moment.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. That was a brief answer. All right.

Man: Mr. Kenny, do you think that over-populated Europe could ever regain its economic health as anything but an industrial entity?

Mr. Kenny: Of course not. But I think that the Germans can dig the coal and stop this job that they are now doing of laying down on coal production and blackmailing the rest of Europe by saying that "we won't produce coal unless you let us have our steel mills back

and let us become a war potential again."

Certainly, in the rest of Europe steel can be manufactured just as well—in France, in the Lorraine. The coal can be taken to where the iron ore is instead of making Germany, as is now suggested, the blacksmith of Europe and an arsenal for rearming a Germany.

That's happened twice in my generation. I think we ought to be smart enough not to let it happen again. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kenny. Now you've got Mrs. Steeves up on her feet again. Yes Mrs. Steeves.

Mrs. Steeves: I want to disagree sharply about the question of the re-industrialization of Germany. I think the Potsdam plan was not a sane plan, because it made the heart of Europe's industrial region, Germany, or it would make it, into a rural slum.

Now it's not industrialization which is the danger. It is the purpose for which industrialization is used, and I ask you whether there isn't just as great a danger or even more so in the great industrial potential and actuality in the United States today, a danger for war, as there would be in a Germany.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. And now here comes General Pearkes. Yes, General?

General Pearkes: I'm going to get in on this. How are you going

to make good farmers out of miners and factory workers?

Mr. Kenny: I can say this. I think there is plenty of need for miners in Germany. They have been given an extra calorie ration above any other workers in Germany, and still their production is only 40 per cent of the 1939 production, while the miners of Poland are now mining at the rate of 140 per cent of their previous production. There's work for miners in Germany; they just won't dig. They're blackmailing us.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. The gentleman down here.

Man: Dr. Compton, is there any assurance that a 1930 depression will not follow a drying-up of Marshall aid after it has been granted the first time?

Dr. Compton: I don't think there is any such assurance, but I don't believe that is the reason for not trying.

Man: To General Pearkes. If the United States is desirous to maintain peace and uphold the United Nations, why doesn't she use the existing channels for world peace and economic aid—the Economic and Security Council?

General Pearkes: She is quite prepared to do that but at the moment the organization is not complete and cannot act fast enough.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mrs. Steeves, do you want to comment?

Mrs. Steves: Well, I disagree with that. It could have acted faster. It has its own Economic Commission under the Security Council functioning in Europe right now. The reason why they don't want the United Nations in is because the United States big corporations, which are hoping to get their pickings out of Europe, want to make their contracts with Europe privately. They don't want any United Nations control. (*Applause.*)

Man: Mr. Kenny. Do you not think that before any more hand-outs are given to Europe that Germany should be made to produce sufficient coal to make European recovery possible?

Mr. Kenny: I think the coal production of Germany is the key to the European recovery that we are talking about, and if we chase out the former Nazis who are still in control—that is, the sub-control—of coal production—the superintendents, who are actually conducting this slow-down, so that coal can be available for building a strong British and a strong French and a strong Eastern European industrial world. That is your answer.

Man: Do you think that democratic socialism would be the solution for Europe rather than the Marshall Plan?

Mrs. Steeves: I think both can be the solution for Europe. I want to tell you that because time was

running short, the last part of my script was cut off and I want to say what I had in it, and that is that there in an alternative to both communism and capitalism. It's democratic socialism, and that is what the majority of people in Europe want if they are only allowed to work out their own salvation.

Capitalism can't save Europe. It thrusts the people of Europe into the terror and poverty that they have endured constantly for centuries. And communism wants to get its own good out of Europe. It will take things out of Europe, but democratic socialism is the move forward in an orderly fashion through the democratic will of the people themselves.

By the way, now I'm here, let me tell Mr. Kenny when he talked so much about coal mining in Germany, he wouldn't be mining much coal if he was in a mine and was getting six or seven hundred calories a day. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Dr. Compton.

Dr. Compton: I don't want to make as long a speech as Mrs. Steeves has. The capitalism that she is so sure has no place in Europe is the only way—capitalism in some form is the only way that Europe can earn its way back into respectability. I think the real problem is what kind of capitalism are you going to have in Europe? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Two conflicting opinions. There's a gentleman in the back of the hall. Yes?

Man: Dr. Compton. Since communism can survive only in chaos and the Soviet plan requires the chaos, how can the Marshall Plan and the Soviet Plan be reconciled?

Dr. Compton: They cannot be reconciled.

Lady: To Mrs. Steeves. Why do you prefer help for Europe from the United Nations rather than the Marshall Plan?

Mrs. Steeves: Well, these two things are not contradictory. The Marshall Plan could be applied to the United Nations. It could be put under United Nations authority. I prefer it because all the nations of the world debate democratically in the United Nations and United Nations control means not just control and the setting of conditions by one powerful capitalist industrialist nation—which would be the United States—but by many nations who have different ideas, and therefore I think it would make a fairer solution.

Moreover, as I said before, we must strengthen the United Nations or else it's going to die out of our hands. That's the most important thing about it.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Kenny.

Mr. Kenny: I want to say that I agree with Mrs. Steeves, but I wanted to come in and point out

that that last question reveals the lack of knowledge of what the Marshall Plan is. Now the Marshall Plan, as Dr. Compton, who is a college president, will tell you, was a commencement speech.

It was a speech that was delivered by General Marshall at Harvard College, and like all commencement speeches, it's how it's applied that we're talking about. And certainly what the application of the Marshall Plan—what is the valuable thing about it is that it carries out the thing that Henry Wallace suggested about two months before when he said that the Truman doctrine ought to be abandoned.

The Marshall Plan is excellent because it proposes that aid shall be given to all of our former allies without discrimination and without political strings. And that is the Marshall Plan.

There is no conflict with the United Nations except that if you do give that aid without using the United Nations as a medium, you will then bypass the greatest instrument for world peace that has ever been fashioned by man. (*Applause.*)

Man: Major General Pearkes. Do you think that the recent action of the Greek Government in their mass arrest of liberal and socialist and communist politicians is a fair example of the use European governments are going to put American aid to?

General Pearkes: I sincerely hope it's not. Because it's rather a tragic use.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady here on the aisle.

Lady: Mr. Kenny. A story is told of a priest and Levite passing by but the good Samaritan did not. In which category do we stand?

Mr. Denny: In which category do we stand, Mr. Kenny?

Mr. Kenny: Well, I think we're very practical—that is, if the new world comes to the aid of the old world, we're being a very practical-minded selfish Good Samaritan, because in helping the old world back on its feet and raising living standards, we deal a wonderful blow in our own behalf. (*Applause.*)

Man: Dr. Compton. Should we not supply producer goods to these people immediately? Also, due to the inflated prices, raise the price of gold, thereby alleviating hardships on repayment?

Dr. Compton: I think it's important to supply the people of Europe that need it the food and shelter that they need right now, and along with it the means of producer goods—either the producer goods or the means of producing the producer goods.

Man: This is to Mr. Kenny or any of the other three speakers.

Mr. Denny: Come on, let's put Bob Kenny on the spot.

Man: Shouldn't the settlement of highly explosive issues like Trieste, the Pacific Islands, treaties with the four Axis powers, encourage our belief in and stimulate our efforts towards the settlement of all controversies?

Mr. Kenny: Exactly. I think—and I'm just going to quote the words of former Secretary of State Byrnes, with which I agree absolutely. You'll recall he said, on October 18, "It is that idea of the inevitability of conflict that is throttling the economic recovery of Europe. It is that idea that is causing artificial tensions between nations, and once we get the notion in our heads that these things can be settled amicably, and that we don't have to go to war, and that we can work out a peaceful economic solution, the sooner we do it the better." Thanks.

Man: My question is to Mrs. Dorothy Steeves. Don't you think that if Great Britain and the United States would withdraw their armies and all their war equipment from Europe, those countries wouldn't need our help?

Mr. Denny: Mrs. Steeves.

Mrs. Steeves: I don't think they could do that just without any preparation whatsoever, because it would be a situation of chaos. I do think that they should use their armies to protect the true forces of democracy. Unfortunately, we have been caught in the situation—the United States seems to be

caught in the situation now where in sending guns instead of bread and butter to Greece and other people that they are supporting militarily very malodorous people—very malodorous people who are Fascists, have been Fascists, and are still displaying Fascist techniques.

You see, not only anti-communists are nice people, and I think in keeping our army there as a police force to keep peace, we should not be taking any side, and the United States army today undoubtedly is doing it. And as soon as possible an international police force under the United Nations should be established which could be used as a neutral police.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman down here.

Man: My question is to Major General Pearkes. How can European nations keep their political freedom when dependent upon the United States for economic support?

General Pearkes: I don't believe that any country in the world could keep absolute political freedom without being dependent on other countries. We're gradually working toward getting one world and we can't help it. The idea of narrow nationalism, I think, have passed from this era.

Man: Dr. Compton. Would not the dangers to peace of German recovery and Russian recalcitrance be overcome if we had

world government capable of enforcing peace?

Dr. Compton: I think so.

Man: My question is to Dorothy Steeves. Should the probability of being repaid be a consideration in giving aid under the Marshall Plan?

Mrs. Steeves: Do you mean should the Americans expect to get their money back?

Man: Yes.

Mrs. Steeves: No, because they won't get it back. I hope no congressmen are listening in.

Man: Dr. Compton. The U. S. A. has just destroyed 80 million bushels of potatoes. Is that a sample of the Marshall Plan? (*Laughter and applause.*)

Dr. Compton: No, but I think that's one of the reasons for the Marshall Plan.

Lady: To Mr. Kenny. Since competitive German industry is essential to make their life zone self-supporting, will the United States long back a policy of restricted industry while taxing themselves to feed that zone?

Mr. Kenny: I'm afraid I cannot answer that question because I disagree with the premise. I do not think industry is essential at all. I think it is highly dangerous, and we should adhere to the Potsdam plan. I would refer the question to someone like one of the other speakers who might think that German recovery is important. I don't.

Mr. Denny: Do any of the other speakers think that German recovery is important enough to speak about it? Mrs. Steeves. All right.

Mrs. Steeves: I certainly do think that German recovery and the recovery of any people is important. As long as there are people in the world who think that you can keep people down and beaten you are going to have war.

General Pearkes: I'm going to side with Mrs. Steeves on that. I think we've got to recover everybody.

Dr. Compton: I want to agree with Mrs. Steeves, too. That's the first time, I think.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you, Dr. Compton. I want to thank all four of you speakers. And while our speakers prepare their summaries of tonight's question, here is a message of interest to you.

Announcer: Town Meeting fans everywhere will be glad to learn that the Town Meeting idea is now flourishing in four countries besides our own. Here in Canada is the Canadian Town Meeting, organized three years ago.

Just this week we received word that Australia has her own radio town meeting called the Nation's Forum of the Air modeled after our own Town Meeting. Radio Stuttgart in Germany broadcasts its Town Meeting regularly in the American zone of occupa-

tion in which the German people participate.

The Japanese people have been holding town meetings regularly for more than a year under the guidance of General MacArthur's staff, and Town Hall Philippines is a going concern. If we could just get our friends in Moscow to join us in some of these discussions and let the Russian people themselves participate, we'd soon get over the war jitters.

You can help promote peace and understanding in your community by organizing a Town Meeting discussion group or a town hall. For further information, address the Secretary, Town Hall, New York 18, New York. Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here's Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: And first with his summary is Mr. Robert Kenny. Mr. Kenny.

Mr. Kenny: I am more interested in the recovery of our former Allies than in the recovery of our former enemies. (*Applause.*) I am optimistic about tonight's meeting. There wasn't a speaker who said a word in defense of that precious Truman Doctrine and two months ago it would have been treason not to cheer it and say that it was the greatest doctrine that was ever conceived by the man to man. And nobody's even dared to defend it two

months later. That's human progress. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kenny. And now a word from General Pearkes.

General Pearkes: The main thought which impressed me today is the urgency of the European situation. I know it's a holiday season now, over here. Nobody wants to be pepped up. Nobody wants to be urged to do anything.

But winter is coming. Food supplies are running short in Europe. Stamina and morale are a low ebb. American dollars are nearly exhausted.

We have heard of the difficulties and doubts regarding the Marshall Plan. But Secretary of State Marshall has given us a lead. Let's follow that up. Or, as they say in the army, get cracking.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Steeves, please.

Mrs. Steeves: This isn't just a European problem. It ties in with the problem of giving human beings all over the world bread and butter, dignity and justice. It catches up right here in Canada and the United States, in our own failures to make people happy and secure, in our own slums and our own racial ghettos. Americans and Canadians will not be able to help Europe unless at the same time they see themselves.

Let's be humble and realize that some of the people of Europe and of Asia, too, poor as they are

have traveled further along the path of political maturity than we have. We can give them goods—we can get ideas from them.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mrs. Steeves. And now, Dr. Compton, please.

Dr. Compton: "Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos." That's what Secretary of State Marshall said.

"We intend to support those who are determined to govern themselves in their own way and who honor the right of others to do likewise." That's what President Truman said to the Canadian Parliament.

I'm not interested in President Truman's politics, but I am interested in what he says as President of the United States. I think that is a sound declaration. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Dr. Compton, Mrs. Steeves, Mr. Kenny, and General Pearkes. I also want to extend our warm thanks to the Canadian Town Meeting, Mr. Arthur Helps, and

Station CJOR, our hosts on this occasion, for their generous hospitality and splendid co-operation.

Now if you, our listeners, want a copy of tonight's program, remember you can secure it by sending 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

Next week we return to the United States to the City of San Francisco, where we'll be the guests of the *San Francisco Chronicle*. Our subject will be "Is the Two-Party System Failing in America?" Our speakers will be Bartley Crum, San Francisco attorney; James Roosevelt, State Chairman for the California Democratic State Central Committee; George Outland; and the Honorable Goodwin J. Knight, Republican, Lieutenant Governor of California.

I am informed that our local committee of judges has awarded the \$210-set of *Encyclopedia Americana* to Mr. Frank. Congratulations, Mr. Frank. We haven't time to read his question.

So plan now to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the crier's bell. (*Applause.*)



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 12

34. Is World Disarmament Possible Now?
35. Would You Rather Live in a Small Town or a Big City?
36. Would You Like To Turn the Clock Back?
37. Should We Have Labor-Management Courts To Settle Labor Disputes?
38. Should Rent Ceilings Be Lifted?
39. Can We Have a 25% Wage Boost Without Raising Prices?
40. How Can Atomic Energy Be Used and Controlled?
43. Should Congress Outlaw the Closed Shop?
44. How Can We Get and Keep Good Teachers in Our Schools?
45. What Should Be Our Program for Germany at the Moscow Conference?
48. How Should the Democracies Meet the Challenge of Spreading Communism?
49. Should the Communist Party Be Outlawed in the United States?
51. Are Cooperatives a Threat to Private Enterprise?

52. Does Our New Foreign Policy Lead to Peace or War?

VOLUME 13

1. What Should We Do About Germany Now?
2. What Can We Do To Get More Housing?
3. Should We Continue the "Voice of America" Broadcasts to Foreign Countries?
4. How Can We Avoid an Economic Bust?
5. How Can We Strengthen the American Family?
6. Are Communism and Christianity Incompatible?
7. What Should We Do About Prices and Rents?
8. Should We Admit 400,000 of Europe's Homeless Now?
9. How Can We Halt the Spread of Russian Power in Europe?
10. Has Twentieth Century Civilization Improved Mankind?
11. Will the Taft-Hartley Law Improve Labor Relations in Industry?
12. Is Universal Military Training Necessary for Our Security?
13. Can We Have An Effective World Organization Without Russia?

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, INC.,
123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate:

26 Weeks for Only
\$2.35
Single Copies 10c